

Applicant: Jimmy Lee Long

: Group Art Unit: 3721

Serial No.: 10/612,481

: Examiner: Harmon, C.R.

Filed: July 1, 2003

: Date: August 6, 2007

Title: PNEUMATIC ROLLER FOR PASSING FILM
WITH ATTACHMENTS THROUGH ROLLERS
OF MACHINE

Hon. Commissioner for Patents
Alexandria, VA 22313

TRANSMITTAL LETTER

Sir:

Transmitted herewith for filing in the above-identified application is a Response to Final Rejection.

FEE FOR ADDITIONAL CLAIMS

☒ A fee for additional claims is not required.

☐ A fee for additional claims is required. The additional fee has been calculated as shown below:

	CLAIMS REMAINING AFTER AMENDMENT		HIGHEST NUMBER PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR		NUMBER OF EXTRA CLAIMS	RATE	ADDITIONAL FEE
TOTAL CLAIMS:	18	-	32	=	0	x \$50 =	0
INDEPENDENT CLAIMS:	2	-	3	=	0	x \$200 =	0
TOTAL FEE DUE							\$ 0

☐ Our check in the amount of \$_____ for payment of the fee for extra claims is enclosed.

☐ Please charge \$_____ to Deposit Account No. 50-3195 in payment of the fee.

☒ The Commissioner is authorized to charge payment of any extension or other fee under 37 CFR 1.16 or 1.17 which may be required by this paper or credit any overpayment of same to Deposit Account No. 50-3195.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney for Applicant

Dennis M. Flaherty
Dennis M. Flaherty
Reg. No. 31,159
Ostrager Chong Flaherty &
Broitman P.C.
570 Lexington Avenue
New York, NY 10022-6894
(212) 681-0600
(212) 681-0300 (fax)



Atty. Docket: ITW-14146

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

Jimmy Lee Long : Group Art Unit: 3721

Serial No.: 10/612,481 : Examiner: Harmon, C.R.

Filed: July 1, 2003

Title: PNEUMATIC ROLLER FOR PASSING FILM
WITH ATTACHMENTS THROUGH ROLLERS
OF MACHINE

Hon. Commissioner for Patents
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE TO FINAL REJECTION

Sir:

In response to the Final Rejection mailed on June 7, 2007 in the above-referenced patent application, the Applicant requests reconsideration in light of the following arguments.

REMARKS

At the outset, Applicant gratefully acknowledges the allowance of claims 14-21.

In ¶ 2 of the action, claims 2-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lawrence (US 5,275,208) in view of Edwards (US 2,647,014). The Applicant traverses this ground of rejection for the following reasons.